



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, edited by F. G. KENYON, M. A. London, The British Museum, 1891.

In the *Revue Critique* of March 9, B. Haussoullier gives the following advice in regard to the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία: 'Empressez-vous d'acheter l'édition de Kenyon et de la lire. Demain vous serez débordés par des commentaires: de tous côtés viendront des *ciceroni* qui se proposeront à vous comme guides et dont vous ne pourrez vous débarrasser: il en viendra d'Angleterre, de France (j'en suis sur), d'Allemagne, de Grèce peut-être. Ne les attendez pas. Enfermez-vous avec les trois livres suivants: l'édition de Kenyon, les fragments d'Aristote publiés par V. Rose dans la collection Teubner (1886), enfin la Politique d'Aristote (édition Susemihl)—et n'ouvrez votre porte qu'après avoir achevé votre lecture. Je vous promets un jour ou deux de pleine jouissance et d'enchantement.' Sound advice in my judgment, but too late for anything more than registry in this tardy number of the *Journal*.

The day after Haussoullier's advice was published the press copy of the second edition reached the office of this *Journal*. 'Quelle découverte, quelle surprise, quel trésor,' says the venerable Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire in a summary of the book published a few weeks ago in the *Revue Bleue* (March 21, 28), but I am sorry to say that little is to be gained from the summary except the exclamation that I have cited, for M. Saint-Hilaire has followed the guidance of Mr. Kenyon much too closely—and, in fact, any guidance at this stage is not to be trusted. The most important conclusions depend on the restoration of a lacuna here and the assumption of an interpolation there, and the attainment of the ultimate text has not been forwarded by the scores of emendations that have flooded the press since the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία first became common property. French and German scholars are, so far as I have seen, unanimous in their gratitude to Mr. Kenyon. Mr. Kenyon's own countrymen have shown him scant courtesy, and have counted too lightly the merit of deciphering the MS, which a scholar like Blass regards as 'no trifle' (was bei der grösstentheils cursiven Schrift keine Kleinigkeit war. Lit. Centralbl. 28 Febr.). And Blass's judgment is echoed by the German translators, Kaibel and Kiessling, who speak of 'the incomparable skill with which Kenyon has deciphered the difficult papyrus.' For one I am too grateful to Mr. Kenyon to join the chorus of depreciators; and when the hurly-burly is done, it may be worth while to ask whether all that abuse of the careless accentuation of the first edition comes with a good grace from a region that is full of accentual sinners, and whether some of the restorations and emendations are not bad enough to console Mr. Kenyon for the harshest strictures of his English critics. One scholar, in order to save formal grammar, insists on διασῶσαι for διασώσσειν (p. 93, 1) and effaces a bit of Thukydean syntax (Goodwin: M. and T., §113) in favor of a bad hiatus. Something must be done with συμμιγείεν τι (p. 109, 13), but as -ειεν, according to Kenyon, is certain, συμμιγῶσι is a brutal emendation, only fit for a novice in the art. συμμιγείς ὥσι would be at least comprehensible. What could be more heedless than to read τῶν ἐσθλῶν, a rank poetic word, instead of τῶν ἐτέρων (p. 77, 15 and p. 78, 5)? And if the editor of the *American Journal of Philology* had not been so often guilty of oscitancy, he might have asked the editors of the *Classical Review* what they were thinking of when they allowed a grammatical hero to emend the innocent αἰτιάται (p. 142,

18) by clapping an impossible iota subscript under its harmless penult. Another scholar, puzzled by the intransitive use of *ἴσατε* (p. 15, 5) in a fragment of Solon, calmly writes *ἴσατε*, a manufactured 2 p. pl. from *ἴα*, as is shown by his translation, 'who have arrived.' 'Should we correct *ἴσατε*?' he asks. I trow not. But I forbear. If Mr. Kenyon has made worse mistakes in Greek than some of his critics, I have failed to notice them.

But the human lessons and the philological lessons to be learned from the *editio princeps* of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, and from the comments of the goodly fellowship of textual critics, will, I trust, be expounded in the pages of the Journal by abler preachers than I am. Still I cannot withhold from younger scholars the delectable parallel between the text of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* and Bergk's restoration. It is the severest warning imaginable against the self-confidence that dares a restoration on any large scale.

Berlin Fr. IIa, Bergk's restoration.¹

(Μετὰ δὲ) | ταῦτα Ν(ικ)οδόημο(ν ἄρ-
χοντος τοῖς τὰ μέ-) | ταλλὰ τὰ ἐν Μαρω-
(νεῖα καὶ τὰ ἐν Λαυρεΐω) | κεκτη(μένοις)
τὰ εἰς² κ(αὐὰ ἔργα ἀπο-) | δόντων (τῶν)
πωλητῶ(ν)³ καὶ μελλόντων τὸ ἄρ-) γύριον
(διανείμαι, Θεμιστοκλῆς παριῶν εἶπεν),
ὅτι χρῆ διανομὴν ἐάσαντας ποιήσασθαι)
| [ναῦς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, καὶ δοῦ-
ναι ἑκατὸν με-]⁴ | ταλλεῦσι (τοῖς)
⁵πλο(υσιωτάτοις εἰς νεὺς κατασκευασ) μὲν⁶
ἑκάστῳ τά(λαντον καὶ ἐὰν ἄρεσῃ ἡ ναῦς),
| τ(ὸ) ἀνάλωμα τῆς (νεὺς τῇ πόλει λογι-
σθῆναι) | ἐ(ὰν) δὲ μή, κομίσασθαι (τὸν
δανεισθὲν· παρὰ δὲ τῶν) | θα(ν)εισασμέ-
νων λα(βεῖν ἑγγύους· οἱ δὲ ἑκατὸν) |
ἐ(π)οίησα(ν) τριήρεις (κάλλει καὶ τάχει
διαφερούσας.)

Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, Kenyon, 62, 6 foll.

ἔπει δὲ τρίτῳ μετὰ ταῦτα Νικοδόημον
ἄρχοντος, ὡς ἐφάνη τὰ μέταλλα τὰ ἐν
Μαρωνεία καὶ περιεγένετο τῇ πόλει
τάλαντα ἑκατὸν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων, συμβου-
λεπόντων τινῶν τῷ δήμῳ διανείμασθαι τὸ
ἀργύριον, Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐκώλυσεν οὐ
λέγων ὅ τι (ὅτι Κ.) χρήσεται τοῖς χρή-
μασιν, ἀλλὰ δανείσαι κελεύων τοῖς πλου-
σιωτάτοις Ἀθηναίων ἑκατὸν ἑκάστῳ τά-
λαντον, εἰτ' ἐὰν μὲν ἄρεσκη τὸ ἀνάλωμα,
τῆς πόλεως εἶναι τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ δὲ μή,
παρακομίσασθαι (read κομίσασθαι, K.,
Class. R., March, 1891) τὰ χρήματα
παρὰ τῶν δανεισμένων, λαβὼν δ' ἐπὶ
τούτοις ἐνα(ν)πηγήσατο τριήρεις ἑκατὸν
κτέ.

No commentary is needed. We are not to read *εἰς* for *ΕΚ*, nor *πωλη* for *ΠΟΛΙ*, nor *-ον* for *ΤΟΝ*. No line is omitted and the *ΑΤΤΑC* supposed to be in the text must have been misread. Polyainos does not enable us to restore Aristotle, and, after making all allowances for the variants of Polyainos's original, the reweaving of the torn and tattered text has not been a success. Even the darning has not been all that could have been desired, for any poor grammatical needle-threader would have put the *εἰ δὲ μή* of Aristotle in antithesis to *ἐὰν* (*μὲν*), rather than the *ἐὰν δὲ μή* of Bergk. Here, as often elsewhere, an ounce of MS is worth more than a hundred-weight of conjectures.

The astounding novelties brought to light by the Constitution of Athens are, it is true, in a measure independent of any reading of the text. The Kylo-nian disturbance had been put before Draco by some scholars, but no one had dreamed that Draco had any hand in constitutional changes; and, no matter

¹ On the basis of Polyain. Strateg. 1, 30, 6. See Rh. Mus. N. F. XXXVI (1881), p. 107.

² *εἰς* for *ΕΚ*. ³ *πωλητω* for *ΠΟΛΙΤΩ*.

⁴ Line dropped by carelessness of scribe.

⁵ *τοῖς πλουσι-* for *ΑΤΤΑC*.

⁶ *μον* for *ΤΟΝ*.

how it may be accounted for, the dead silence as to the severity of Draco's legislation is as surprising as the mention of his constitutional readjustments. The explanation that in a work on the constitution, Aristotle had only constitutional changes in view, is by no means satisfactory, for there is no such rigorous exclusion elsewhere of extra-constitutional matter. Now, when we come to this important point, what do we read in a certain summary? 'The upper classes gave way and agreed to invest a leading citizen, named Draco, with full powers to reform the constitution.' What does Aristotle say? *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* (the Kylonian troubles) *χρόνον τινὸς οὐ πολλοῦ διελθόντος ἐπ' Ἀρισταίχμον ἄρχοντος Δράκων* τοὺς θεσμοὺς ἔθηκεν. 'The upper classes giving way,' 'the leading citizen,' 'the full powers,' 'the reform of the constitution,' are inferences, natural inferences, if you choose, but they are extra-Aristotelian. And so it is everywhere. The temptation to read between the lines is so strong that summaries are not to be trusted, and the only translation I have seen thus far, Kaibel and Kiessling's, is a paraphrase of which a like complaint may be made. In spite of the best intentions, the old controversies sway the pens of those scholars who have undertaken at short notice to rewrite the history of Athens from the point of view of this important document; and delight at the confirmation of former guesses and disgust at the refutation of previous fancies make it very hard to deal with the personal equation. The man who knows nothing about the history of Athens cannot understand the significance of the new document, and he who knows too much is sorely tempted to wrest it or to underrate it.

It will be a long time before all the accessions that have accrued from this, the most important find of the century, shall have been registered and distributed. Grammar and lexicography are not without their share, and I have elsewhere called attention to a use of *ἕως* for which the grammars have been waiting. The regularity of *πρὶν* has found additional evidence, and my conjecture, made years ago (A. J. P. I 458; IV 92), Solon, fr. 36, 21,

πρὶν ἀναταράξας πῖαρ¹ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα

has been confirmed, and, as Mr. Kenyon says there is room for *ἀνατ.*, that is perhaps better than Mr. Adam's more seductive *ἀνταράξας*, Crito 44 D (see The Nation, Apr. 2, 1891). And not only has the *Ἀθην. πολιτεία* corrected a passage that was known before, but it has brought us some new fragments of the great Athenian poet and lawgiver; of short compass, it is true, but not without interest. The elegy which is put down as fr. 4 Bergk, notoriously lacks the beginning, and this beginning is supplied by Aristotle. Another fragment seems to lurk in the sentence (fr. 15, 10): *διὸ καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐλεγείας δεδοικέναι φησὶ τήν τε φιλαργυρίαν τήν τε ὑπερφηάναν*. The double *τε* connecting two words is more than suspicious, and so is the rhythm:

τήν τε φιλαργυρίην τήν θ' ὑπερφηάνην.

The jingle as in

4, 20: *ὃς πολλῶν ἐρατὴν ὤλεσεν ἡλικίην.*

32: *ὃς κακὰ πλείστα πόλει δυσνοοίη παρέχει.*

10, 2: *δείξει ἀληθείης ἐς μέσον ἐρχομένης.*

11, 4: *καὶ διὰ ταῦτα κακὴν ἔσχετε δουλοσύνην.*

¹ The *Ἀθην. πολ.* has *πῦαρ*.

The article, which Solon uses rarely, as in 15, 3, with a strong deictic sense:

ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς αὐτοῖς οὐ διαμενόμεθα
τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον,

though we should expect *ὑμετέραν* as in *ὑμετέραν κακότητα* (11, 1). How many have 'discovered' this I do not know. Two of England's most distinguished scholars are credited with the observation in the March number of the *Classical Review*. The only wonder is that it should have escaped the editor. And yet the verse is not very satisfactory as a verse, and those who laugh at

Bellerophonteis sollicitudinibus

will have to plead the Bellerophontean anxieties of Solon's position as a justification of this inartificial pentameter, which cannot be paralleled in Bergk's Elegiac Poets. But that something of the sort must have stood in the original is shown by Plut. Sol. c. 14, 3: *ὁκνῶν φησὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀψασθαι τῆς πολιτείας καὶ δεδοικῶς τῶν μὲν τὴν φιλοχρηματίαν τῶν δ' ὑπερρηφανίαν*. And yet it is dangerous to proceed mechanically in this matter of restoration, lest one be tempted by the rhythm into some such pitfall as engulfed Kock when he was seduced by the iambic tetrameter into the memorable identification of a solemn verse of St. Paul (2 Tim. 4, 6) with a comic *ἀδέσποτον* (No. 768).

It will be observed that in this preliminary notice I have not adorned the name of Aristotle with the quotation-marks by which some scholars have undertaken to exhibit a scholarly skepticism. That the book is the book known in antiquity as Aristotle's is beyond a question. Whether it was composed by Aristotle himself is another matter. Some have missed Aristotle's technical terms, his familiar crabbednesses, his significant implications. But Aristotle was a man of the world as well as a philosopher, and as a man of the world he must have had more than one style, so that it would be fairer to admire his versatility than to insist on uniformity. If I may be allowed to record my own impressions, receiving the book before the flood of criticisms reached me, my first thought was to compare the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* with the more fluent portions of the *Politics*, and mindful of what Blass had noted in his *Attische Beredsamkeit* II 428, I kept watch for hiatus, for rhythm, and not in vain. In what I may be pardoned for calling the aridities of the Aristotelian corpus, the *flumen orationis aureum* of which Cicero tells us runs far underground, but the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* enables us to understand that the current of this simple brook might be swollen into a golden stream. Mr. Newman, who ought to know, is skeptical, but Diels, who has a right to be heard, concludes his essay in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* IV 3, p. 479, with the following words: 'Diese *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (ist) nicht nur echt aristotelisch sondern aristotelischer als die meisten der uns erhaltenen Lehrbücher an welche sich jene Skeptiker halten.'

B. L. G.